

It cannot escape the administration that the Congress has repudiated its approach toward Bosnia for the past 2 years. An overwhelming bipartisan majority has opposed the arms embargo, and Congress has voiced concerns with respect to peace plans that would destroy the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. So, to operate under the assumption that Congress will approve administration plans to send thousands of Americans in harm's way to enforce a settlement is a major error. The fact is that the Clinton administration may be making promises it cannot or should not keep.

Therefore, I am writing today to the chairmen of the Appropriations, Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees to request that they hold extensive hearings on this critical issue. I will request that the questions asked in the letter to President Clinton form the basis of their examination of this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter we sent to the President today be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER,
Washington, DC, September 25, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is our understanding that your administration, together with our NATO allies, is completing plans to enforce a potential settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina—a settlement not yet finalized. Much to our dismay, what we have learned about possible U.S. troop obligations has been largely from press reports. To date, your administration has failed to consult with the Congress on the nature and extent of commitments made to our NATO allies and the Bosnian government regarding U.S. participation in a force to implement a settlement. We are especially concerned since those forces must consist primarily of ground troops. There should be no doubts that without the concurrence of the Congress these commitments will not be fulfilled.

In our view, your administration must answer the following questions as soon as possible in order that the Senate may begin to fulfill its responsibility to carefully evaluate this matter:

(1) What specific commitments regarding U.S. troop participation have been made by your administration to our NATO allies?

(2) What specific commitments regarding U.S. troop participation have been made by your administration to the Bosnian government?

(3) What is the range of total NATO ground force levels, related to enforcement of a Bosnian peace settlement, being considered in the administration and at NATO headquarters? What would the U.S. contribution of forces be? What is the estimate of the number of reservists that would need to be called up? What is the estimated impact of such a deployment on readiness?

(4) Would this be a NATO-only operation or would Russian troops and/or other troops, from Islamic countries for example, also be a part of that total force enforcing a settlement?

(5) Would NATO be in complete command of all forces involved in an enforcement operation? Or would Russian forces and non-NATO forces be under different command arrangements? If so, how would these varied command arrangements be ultimately integrated in order to achieve unity of command? Is there to be another dual-key command?

(6) When would NATO forces be deployed—immediately after an agreement is signed or after Bosnian government and Bosnian Serb forces withdraw to lines of demarcation? What if the fighting does not stop after an agreement is signed?

(7) Is there a time table for UNPROFOR withdrawal? Would some of these U.N. units, from NATO contributing countries, remain as part of the new force?

(8) When would the “dual key” be eliminated? Would there be any other U.N. input into the command arrangements?

(9) What would the rules of engagement for NATO forces be?

(10) Where would NATO troops be deployed? In Bosnian Serb controlled territory?

(11) Would Bosnian government forces be supplied with additional arms during this enforcement period so that Bosnia can better defend itself against aggression after NATO forces leave? If so, what types of weapons would be provided and by whom? Has a commitment to provide military assistance—to include arms and/or training—to the Bosnian government in a post-settlement period been made by Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, or any other administration officials to Bosnian government officials?

(12) How long would NATO troops be deployed? What is the exit strategy?

(13) What are the estimated costs of such a NATO deployment? What would the U.S. share be and how does the administration plan to pay for it?

Mr. President, these are not the only questions that will need to be answered, but they are essential to any Congressional debate and consideration of commitments made by you and your administration with respect to U.S. troops participating in an enforcement operation.

There are also matters of principle that will have to be carefully considered. First and foremost is a very fundamental question—whether United States forces should be deployed to partition a sovereign and independent country into two entities. Our men and women in the military have protected our freedom and our interests and defended our principles. Do we want to place our soldiers in harms' way to defend the compromise of our principles? We must also ask whether or not any settlement reached has been agreed to freely by the Bosnian government and without coercion. We are concerned about news reports that senior administration officials gained Bosnian government agreement on the first set of “Agreed Principles” by threatening a halt in NATO bombing. Finally, we must ask whether it would not be more just and more wise to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina, and allow the Bosnians to fight until there is a stable military balance—the precondition for any settlement which would not require the deployment of thousands of American and NATO troops to police it.

Mr. President, we have serious concerns about the commitments you and your administration reportedly have made with respect to U.S. participation—to include thousands of ground forces—in enforcing a possible Bosnian peace settlement. We hope that you will begin to consult earnestly and forthrightly with the Congress in the very near future.

Sincerely,

ROBERT DOLE,

JOHN W. WARNER,
THAD COCHRAN,
BOB SMITH,
JESSE HELMS,
ARLEN SPECTER,
JAMES M. INHOFE,
DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
JON KYL,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON.

Mr. DOLE. I reserve the balance of my leader's time.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1966

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous order is the Senator from Maryland is to be recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to my colleagues what we hope to achieve here this evening.

The Senator from Maryland will be recognized. I understand there is a 1-hour time agreement. We are willing to accept a 1-hour time agreement on the amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. It has already been agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. We will do that amendment and then the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS. I understand there is a 30-minute time agreement agreed to or willing to be agreed to. We will have those two votes.

By that time, we hope to be in a position to announce what will happen to the remainder of the evening. I am hopeful that Members who still have amendments will be willing to debate those amendments tonight and we will start voting on the amendments tomorrow.

We are talking about the additional amendments. There are two Rockefeller amendments, a Baucus amendment, Moseley-Braun.

Ms. MIKULSKI. As you know, we have been moving along very well on this bill, and what we will endeavor to do, and I thought we had, is to see if Senators ROCKEFELLER and BAUCUS will offer their amendments tonight because they are on the Finance Committee. That would, I think, take us through a substantial part of the evening.

Mr. DOLE. I suggest after these two votes we will announce what agreement we have been able to reach. We may not be able to reach any agreement. I do not want to keep raising this, but whether or not we are in session next week depends on whether or not we finish this bill, Labor-HHS, and State, Justice, and Commerce.

Yesterday we did not do anything. We had debate on one amendment. The amendment was voted on at 2:15 today.

My view is it is our hope we can finish this bill tonight and finish Labor-HHS by Thursday and dispose of the other bills by Saturday. If we cannot

do it, we cannot do it, and we will be here next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2782

(Purpose: To restore homeless assistance funding to fiscal year 1995 levels using excess public housing agency project reserves, and for other purposes.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] for himself, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 2782.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . HOMELESS ASSISTANCE FUNDING.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS.—

(1) REDUCED APPROPRIATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available under title II of this Act under the heading "HOUSING PROGRAMS" under the subheading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS", is reduced from \$4,350,862,000 to \$3,990,862,000.

(2) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in using amounts made available under title II of this Act under the heading "HOUSING PROGRAMS" under the subheading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS" to renew an annual contributions contract with a public housing agency administering the tenant-based existing housing certificate program under section 8(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(d)) or the housing voucher program under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall take into account the amount in the project reserve under the contract being renewed in determining the amount of budget authority to obligate under the renewed contract.

(b) HOMELESS ASSISTANCE.—

(1) INCREASED APPROPRIATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available under title II of this Act under the heading "HOMELESS ASSISTANCE" under the subheading "HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS" is increased from \$760,000,000 to \$1,120,000,000.

(2) RESTRICTION.—Notwithstanding section 504 or any other provision of this Act, of the funds made available under title II of this Act under the heading "HOMELESS ASSISTANCE" under the subheading "HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS", \$360,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1996, and shall remain available until expended.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, am I correct that we have 30 minutes on this side and 30 minutes for the manager of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask the Chair to inform me when that time has been utilized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I very much hope that Members will perceive this amendment in a way that will enable us to adopt it. In fact, I hope the manager of the bill will accept it, after we discuss it a bit.

What this amendment does is restore \$360 million for homeless assistance funding. It brings the funding for the homeless back to the 1995 level of \$1,120,000,000. The bill reported from the Appropriations Committee has a figure of \$760,000,000. That is a cut of \$360 million—a cut of 32 percent from the 1995 funding level—the largest percentage funding cut of any of HUD's formula-driven programs.

Homeless assistance programs are a critical part of the safety net.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. Members who are having conversation in the aisles will please retire to the cloakroom.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. The homeless assistance programs are a critical part of the safety net. The safety net is being badly shredded. I certainly hope it would not happen to the programs that really deal with the people who are out on the street—people who are out on the street without a place to stay.

The offset for this additional money would take funds out of section 8 program reserves. Housing authorities that have expiring section 8 contracts have money available to them. In the past, the authorities have been able to roll the reserves over. This amendment would utilize those funds for section 8 renewals. In the past, the public housing authorities have used the reserves to augment the section 8 program. I regret using section 8 as an offset because I think the section 8 program is also very important. But, in deciding between these two choices, it seems to me we have to pay more attention to the pressing problem of the homeless.

The Secretary of HUD has sent a letter indicating that the expiring section 8 contracts could be renewed by the money provided in the bill—even after this offset—even after the utilization of the \$360 million—in order to bring the funding for the homeless up to this year's level.

Let me very quickly cover the importance of passing this amendment. On September 11, there appeared an excellent article in the Washington Post by Lucie McKinney, the widow of Stewart McKinney, Republican Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Connecticut. Representative McKinney was a very able and distinguished Member of the Congress who took a very keen interest in the problems of the homeless. In fact, the McKinney Act programs are named after him. That act includes the range of homeless programs addressed by this amendment.

Ms. McKinney points out, "I'm stunned that Congress, which has proclaimed its commitment to finding and funding plans that actually work,

would allow these cuts to stand." She is talking about the cuts to the homeless programs.

She goes on to cite two studies which conclusively demonstrate that the supportive housing dimension of the homeless program is working exceedingly well. As she notes, " * * * cuts, far from saving money, will waste it." She goes on to say, "Put simply, not housing our most vulnerable Americans costs millions more than housing them. It's just common sense."

And she concludes this article: " * * * we do know how to end homelessness. And while the cure is not cost-free, it costs a whole lot less than not facing—and solving—the problem. Saving lives and saving money—how can that be bad?"

Increasing the homeless funding back up to the 1995 levels will provide an opportunity to reform how the homeless assistance programs are administered. The most notable feature of the reform effort is the push to convert the existing collection of seven categorical grant programs at HUD into a single program delivered by formula to State and local governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator he has used 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. A formula grant will allow better organization at the local level and facilitate better planning as funding levels become more predictable. The VA-HUD bill allows a formula approach, but it does not provide adequate funding. This amendment would raise the total homeless funding to a level that would allow a formula approach to make sense. In fact, the Appropriations Committee recognized it in their report. The committee stated: "The committee is worried that the block grant approach with funds less than \$1 billion may disadvantage some areas with significant homeless problems and homeless providers."

This amendment addresses that problem. It brings the homeless funding figure back up to this year's level and makes it possible to use the formula approach. Almost everyone is supportive of a formula approach. In fact, the Senate Banking Committee reported a bill that included such a program last year on a bipartisan, 15 to 3 vote.

I am not going to go through a litany of the numbers of people who are on the street. I do want to point out, however, how much of this is a veterans problem. Well over a third of the homeless have served in the Armed Forces. It is estimated that about 275,000 veterans are homeless on any given night. The single largest segment of homeless veterans—55 to 60 percent—are from the Vietnam era.

The demand for these funds is significant. Last year applications for funds for assistance to the homeless were 2½ times the amount which the Congress had appropriated.

Let me discuss the offset further. The offset for this amendment comes from section 8 contract renewal accounts. Currently, HUD is holding reserves in section 8 contracts on behalf of housing agencies that administer the section 8 program. The amendment would allow HUD to take into account the project reserves when considering the amount to provide housing agencies when contracts are to be renewed. Money would not be available to, in effect, uplift the section 8 program. The HUD Secretary has assured us, however, that enough money would remain to do the contract renewals.

I therefore suggest to my colleagues, in terms of priority, it makes eminent good sense to shift this money out of section 8 and put it into the homeless programs. The last thing we want to see is people wandering our streets, many of them suffering from mental and physical disabilities. It is a problem that cuts to the very heart of what we stand for as a society.

This amendment offers the opportunity to bring it back to this year's level and to enable us to move forward in partnership with State and local governments and with the private sector—churches, community groups and other similar action organizations—in order to address this very pressing problem.

I very strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague from Maryland for offering this amendment.

Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment. These subcommittees and committees have tough choices to make, but the reference has already been made to the op-ed piece by the widow of our former House colleague, Stewart McKinney. Senator SARBANES referred to two studies. Let me just read from that one study.

The first study found that formerly homeless people with severe mental illnesses achieved stability at a rate of 83.4 percent in supportive housing. Tenants also cut their hospital inpatient use by 50 percent. The 4-year evaluation concluded that this unique housing "not only will alleviate human suffering, but also will reduce costs for institutionalization and hospitalization."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1995]

DUMB MOVE ON HOUSING

(By Lucie C. McKinney)

Right before the summer break, the House approved drastic cuts to housing programs for the neediest Americans: homeless people who have chronic mental and medical illnesses. Four of these—the McKinney Programs, named after my late husband, Stewart B. McKinney, who was a Republican representative from Connecticut—face reductions of 40 percent or \$444 million (as compared to the unasked-for \$7 billion the House decided to give the Pentagon). Usually when I testify before Congress I talk about the people who have reclaimed their lives through the offer of housing and a helping hand. In keeping with the times, however, I'd like to reframe the debate—and talk about statistics and cold, hard cash.

I'm stunned that Congress, which has proclaimed its commitment to finding and funding plans that actually work, would allow these cuts to stand. The McKinney Programs provide funding from something called supportive housing—permanent housing linked to a safety net of support services that allow even chronically disabled people who are homeless to live autonomously in hope and dignity. And according to the evidence, including two separate government evaluations, supportive housing is our best bet for ending homelessness and doing so cost-effectively.

The first study found that formerly homeless people with severe mental illnesses achieved stability at a rate of 83.4 percent in supportive housing. Tenants also cut their hospital inpatient use by 50 percent. The four-year evaluation concluded that this unique housing "not only will alleviate human suffering, but also will reduce costs for institutionalization and hospitalization. The five projects [studied] offer proof that the face of homelessness in America can be changed dramatically."

The second evaluation found a success rate of 84.5 percent and concluded that supportive housing—"provided cost-effective assistance to help families and individuals escape from homelessness."

So. These programs actually end homelessness, which is one of those seemingly intractable social problems we thought would be a permanent part of the American urban landscape.

As to the cost, Congress doesn't seem to grasp the fact that cuts, far from saving money, will waste it. Put simply, not housing our most vulnerable Americans costs millions more than housing them. It's just common sense: People with mental illnesses end up using expensive hospital beds, state psychiatric institutions and even jails as de facto housing; people with AIDS end up in acute-care beds (at more than \$1,000 a day); people with alcohol or drug dependencies stay too long in high-cost treatment programs. Meanwhile, they are still homeless, still dependent on crisis services and no closer to living independent productive lives. This is worse than penny-wise, pound-foolish—it's billions foolish.

The cost of providing housing linked to services, on the other hand, can be as little as \$10,000 a year, an expenditure that actually ends that person's homelessness and allows him or her to use clinics instead of emergency rooms, counseling instead of psychiatric hospitalizations and drug counseling instead of treatment centers. Supportive housing also promotes self-sufficiency through employment and education linkages. Aren't these the very goals Congress is so anxious to advance?

My late husband was committed to ending the blight of widespread homelessness. Four

months before he died, he even spent a night on the streets in 20-below weather to bring media attention to the plight of homeless people. Yes, he was deathly ill at the time, but so are more than 70 percent of homeless Americans.

We may not have a cure for AIDS, cancer or a way to provide health care to all Americans, but we do know how to end homelessness. And while the cure is not cost-free, it costs a whole lot less than not facing—and solving—the problem. Saving lives and saving money—how can that be bad?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Chicago Sun Times entitled "Rush To Trim Budget Cuts Off Homeless" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Sept. 13, 1995]

RUSH TO TRIM BUDGET CUTS OFF HOMELESS

Once again, Congress is using a machete instead of a paring knife to cut the federal budget to help pay for an unaffordable tax cut.

The latest casualty is the McKinney Homeless Services Program. The House already voted to cut the program by 44 percent, to \$676 million. Today, the Senate Appropriations Committee will consider a plan to reduce it by a third, to \$760 million. The short-term savings ignore the long-term expense of their actions.

Housing providers use McKinney money to pay for supportive services to people who otherwise would be living on the streets. On the streets, homeless people spend their energy looking for food and a safe place to sleep. They can't waste time seeking treatment for substance abuse, mental illness or AIDS. They aren't enrolled in job training programs. They can't even get a bath and a change of clothes—the first step toward a job.

Formerly homeless people now living in Lakefront SRO (single room occupancy) apartment buildings can do all those things. Lakefront provides the services for \$2,500 per person per year at six buildings in Chicago. Shelters—the primary housing option for most homeless people—cost as much as four times that and provide little more than a place to sleep. If the homeless person ends up in a hospital or prison, the taxpayers' burden skyrockets—without any hope of breaking the cycle of homelessness.

No doubt, senators will emerge from today's committee meeting patting themselves on the back for having restored some of the draconian cuts made by the House. But they still must answer tough questions about how much saving \$440 million now will cost us later.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on Sunday—I happened to spend a weekend in Washington—I was reading a little bit from a small book that I had not read for years. It was Will Durant's "The Lessons of History." What he says in this book—my colleague from Maryland who is a history buff will appreciate this also—is that there is, among other things, one consistent action in nations; that is, the struggle between those who are fortunate and those who are less fortunate. And those who are fortunate usually put the squeeze on those who are less fortunate, and ultimately it hurts those who are more fortunate.

I think we are going through that struggle in a variety of ways right here

in this very Senate. I can remember—I see some of my colleagues on the floor who will remember this, also. Maybe the Presiding Officer is young enough not to remember this. But I can remember when we did not have anywhere near the number of homeless people on the streets of our Nation that we have today. In Chicago, on Madison Avenue, there was a place where we had what we used to call winos. I am afraid it was not a respectful term. But it was used commonly where the winos were. But we did not have homeless people as generally as we have today.

Then I look at this allocation within the subcommittee. I find that the largest percentage cut in any of HUD's formula-driven programs is 32 percent which is taken off of the programs for the homeless.

We are not going to have any homeless here lobbying us on this one. There are not any big campaign contributions from any homeless. But it sure says something about our priorities and where we are.

Let me just add, my friends, that I know it is tough for the chairman of this subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee to make these choices. It can get worse. I heard my colleague from Illinois, Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, the other day refer to an article in a history magazine that I happened to read also which talked about homelessness in New York City back at the turn of the century when young people were dropped off at churches. And that is where we got the name "foundlings." People found them in churches, and they would take train loads of these young people from New York City and take them out to the West, to Wyoming, to California, to Oregon. People would show up at the train station and look around and find a child that they might want to adopt and take care of.

Can things get worse? You bet they can get worse.

This is a program that works. Yes. We have tough decisions to make. But before we take money and say we have to have a tax cut, we have tough decisions to make. But here is one. If you are to say who are the people who desperately need help in terms of public housing and in terms of health, it is these homeless people. I am sure none of them are registered to vote, or very few of them are. But some of them have mental illness. Some of them have alcohol and drug problems, a variety of problems. We ought to help them.

That is what the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland is doing. I am proud to stand up and urge adoption of this amendment. This is one that ought to be an easy vote for Members of the Senate.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). At this point the Senator from Maryland has 16 minutes, and the Senator from Missouri has 30.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, I appreciate the good motives. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Maryland, the leader of the authorizing committee on his side. I appreciate the thoughtful comments by the Senator from Illinois as well.

But unfortunately, this is an effort to take money from one pocket and put it in another pocket. It does so in a way that I do not think is particularly productive. I think it may even be counterproductive. While I commend them for their motives, I do not think it accomplishes anything.

This is in the arcane rule of scoring budgetary authority and outlays. I apologize in advance to my colleagues. But let me tell you what has happened.

The amendment proposes a budgetary offset from the HUD appropriations. It takes it out of the renewal of section 8 rental subsidy contracts. It takes out \$360 million. The amendment is predicated on the reduction of project reserves. These are reserves held by local housing authorities for section 8 certificates and vouchers in use for low-income families to cover potential increases in rent or reductions in resident income during the remaining contract term. In other words, this is taking money away from one group of very poor who need housing to another group of very poor who need housing.

During the consideration of the recently enacted rescissions bill, we closely examined the funding needs of the existing section 8 contracts to remove any excess funds. Only 4 months ago, this body, along with the House and the President, after we carefully assessed the needs, determined that some \$427 million could be rescinded from the section 8 reserves without, in our view, potentially jeopardizing the sound financing of these outstanding rental contracts. That rescission has already been enacted into law. We now find ourselves a few months later again attempting to raid these contract reserves to fund increased homeless activities.

There are two things I could say about the amendment. If we fail to adequately maintain reserves for the cost of section 8 contracts, we will surely need additional homeless funding to assist the families that get evicted when their rental contracts run out of money. So we could be pushing another group out into the street.

Mr. President, the pending amendment proposes to cut another \$360 million from section 8 contract reserves. I should point out that more than half the current estimate of the total amount held in these reserves is by local housing authorities.

New York City, for example, stands to lose as much as \$90 million if this reduction is taken proportionately. Such a large reduction could jeopardize the financial viability of the contracts issued and administered by that large housing authority.

I note that those who suggest this reduction in contract reserves claim that the section 8 amendment funding could be provided at a later point to make up any shortfalls. Unfortunately, this assumes there will be adequate funding within our budget allocation to accommodate such an appropriation request, in addition to meeting the growing renewal needs of these section 8 contracts, all in the face of further reductions in overall discretionary spending.

Mr. President, that is the fallacy behind this offset. I described earlier the difficulties in finding offsets. There are no easy places to find offsets.

In reality, this measure is no offset at all because the net effect of the amendment is to increase program funding levels. It simply proposes to borrow funds previously set aside for section 8 program costs to augment yet another activity, neither of which can be maintained in the future at the increased spending levels if we ever hope to balance the Federal budget.

I should add that the sponsors of this amendment have acknowledged the real programmatic effect of this budgetary shell game by delaying the availability of the \$360 million added for homeless programs until the last day of the year.

I refer my colleagues who are interested to page 3 of the amendment. The last paragraph says "Restriction."

Notwithstanding section 504, or any other provision of this act, the funds made available under title II of this act under the subheading "homeless assistance" grants, \$360 million shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1996, and shall remain available until expended.

In other words, to avoid the Budget Act point of order, they said they are appropriating it for the coming year, but you cannot spend it until the end of the next fiscal year, to avoid the Budget Act point of order for breaching the fiscal year 1996 allocation.

Mr. President, I merely point out that if the sponsors of the amendment are concerned about increasing fiscal year 1997 homeless program spending, then it would be wise simply to wait until next year's appropriations bill and offer an amendment to take funds from the 1997 appropriations. Maybe we can work with the sponsors and the proponents of the amendment to find funding in that year. But it looks like a difficult year. This is an effort to fund in 1997 some programs from the budget authority in 1996.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. The best of motives but, unfortunately, will do nothing towards meeting the current need for homeless assistance activities. It does not even click in until September of next year. It undermines our budgetary and deficit control efforts, and it jeopardizes the viability of housing assistance contracts currently in use by thousands of families across the Nation.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First of all, the amendment does not jeopardize the contracts. We have a letter here from the Secretary of HUD. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

Mr. BOND. Could I see a copy of that?

Will the Senator provide me a copy, please.

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOP-
MENT,

Washington, DC, September 26, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,
Senate Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR PAUL: I am writing this letter to express my support for an amendment to the Senate Appropriations bill which would restore the level of funding for the homeless assistance programs to their FY 1995 level, or \$1.12 billion. This amendment would offset the homeless funding level increase of \$360 million with a concomitant reduction in the section 8 renewal account.

Funding for the renewal of expiring contracts can be reduced without any impact on existing recipients because many public housing agencies have sufficient reserves in their section 8 tenant-based contracts. These agencies can use these reserves to renew expiring contracts before receiving additional federal resources.

As you know, the FY 1995 Rescission law required the Department to use available PHA reserves in the same manner as this amendment would provide.

We therefore fully support the amendment that would offset the increased Homeless funding level with available PHA reserves for section 8 tenant-based contract renewals.

Thank you your consideration.

Sincerely,

HENRY CISNEROS.

Mr. SARBANES. The Secretary says:

I am writing this letter to express my support for an amendment to the Senate Appropriations bill which would restore the level of funding for the homeless assistance programs to the FY 1995 level of \$1.12 billion. This amendment would offset the homeless funding level increase of \$360 million with a concomitant reduction in the section 8 renewal account.

Funding for the renewal of expiring contracts can be reduced without any impact on existing recipients—

I underscore that “existing recipients”—

Because many public housing agencies have sufficient reserves in their section 8 tenant-based contracts. These agencies can use these reserves to renew expiring contracts before receiving additional Federal resources.

As you know, the FY 1995 Rescission law required the Department to use available PHA reserves in the same manner as this amendment would provide.

The amendment uses these reserves. That means the reserves are not available if they want to upgrade the section 8 program. Public housing agencies would be less able to issue more contracts or cover rent increases. The amendment does leave enough money to fulfill existing contracts.

The real question then becomes: Is it a sufficiently higher priority to address

the problem of the homeless, even though we have to move money out of another program? I think the problems of the homeless are a critical priority.

What the extra money for the homeless program would enable us to do is use a formula approach. Virtually everyone is in favor of a formula approach. The additional funds made available in this amendment would become part of a larger pool which would enable the Department to apply the formula to allocate the funds. We need enough funds to make the formula realistic.

The fact that the additional money in this amendment can not be committed in a contract with a State or local government until the end of the fiscal year does not affect then the ability of the States and the localities to prepare for the money on the basis of a formula allocation and to develop their programs accordingly. The committee report says that “funding for a formula below \$1 billion will mean that many communities with significant homeless programs will not get adequate resources to design and maintain assistance programs to meet their needs.” This amendment would provide enough money and make possible a major reform in the administration of HUD’s homeless programs.

Ever since 1989, the Congress has repeatedly increased the amount of money available for homeless assistance. This amendment merely tries to keep the funding level from 1995 to 1996. And, in this amendment, we have an offset that comes out of another housing account. I am not happy about the offset. I think the housing accounts are being markedly shortchanged. But, when it comes to a judgment as to whether we ought to let the bill’s drastic cut in the money for the homeless stand or draw some money off of the section 8 reserves, it seems to me that we ought to use the section 8 reserves in order to assure that the homeless program can continue at a reasonable level.

I again want to underscore that a significant number of Members are talking about are the needs of veterans in the context of the bill before us. The amendment raises a question of priorities. I say to my distinguished friend from Missouri, in the choice between leaving these funds in reserve accounts to be rolled over into section 8 versus providing shelter for homeless veterans, I have chosen to move the money to the homeless programs. The money left in the section 8 account after this amendment will cover existing contracts. What will be lost is the housing authorities’ reserves that are there to cover increases the contract subsidy or to cover rent increases. I say to my colleague: Between those two alternatives it seems to me that raising the level of appropriations for the homeless ought to take precedent.

As Lucie McKinney said in this very strong and moving article, “We do know how to end homelessness.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield myself one minute. The article by Ms. McKinney continues: “And while the cure is not cost free, it costs a whole lot less than not facing and solving the problem. Saving lives and saving money, how can that be bad?”

Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point the Senator from Maryland has 10 minutes and 40 seconds and the Senator from Missouri 23 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Sarbanes amendment which would restore funding for the homeless assistance program. But I also rise in strong support of the leadership and advocacy provided by the senior Senator from Maryland. I am not the kind of person who likes being No. 2, but I am more than satisfied to be No. 2 to this distinguished Member of the Senate, our senior Senator.

As we know, he is the ranking member on the Housing Committee. He has chaired the Subcommittee on Housing for a number of years, and his advocacy in promoting homeownership, opportunities for the poor in terms of shelter, and economic and community development as well as banking reform I think are to be acknowledged.

Senator SARBANES really wanted to offer many amendments to this bill because there are issues in this bill related to housing and their skimpy allocation that warrant both debate and additional amendments. He has chosen to focus his amendment on the poorest of the poor, that constituency in our society that has the least advocacy.

The bill before us provides \$760 million for homeless assistance programs, a cut of \$360 million under last year’s appropriation and the President’s request.

The Sarbanes amendment will restore this funding to the President’s request of \$1.12 billion.

Preliminary analysis of this cut is that HUD would serve a total of 93,000 fewer homeless Americans, including 11,000 people who would have received housing if funding had been continued at current levels; 23,000 Americans who would lose their homes by denying them homeless prevention assistance that provides short-term rental and utility subsidies in times of family or financial crisis; 11,000 day care slots which would force the working poor to choose between working full-time and caring for their kids; 16,000 disabled Americans would lose mental health counseling provided under current levels; 14,000 homeless persons would be denied substance abuse counseling; and 20,000 homeless families would lose opportunities for job placement through HUD and nonprofit agencies.

These numbers are staggering.

In fact, this cut represents the first reduction in the homeless program since 1989.

What bothers me most about this cut in homeless funding is the impact of this cut coupled with others that are coming down the pike.

Over the past 25 years the construction of the interstate highway system, immigration and migration trends, the shift from manufacturing to service and knowledge-based industries, and the flight of the middle class have weakened our cities.

Poverty is growing and becoming more concentrated.

Twenty-five years ago 3.8 million people lived in the poorest neighborhoods in our largest 94 cities.

Today, 10.8 million people live in those same areas.

In those same 94 cities, unemployment increased by 66 percent between 1970 and 1990.

The percentage of people employed in manufacturing jobs has dropped from 22.1 to 14 in the last 20 years.

The point is that as we look across the agenda that the new majority in this Congress is promoting, you can't help but notice the devastating cumulative impacts of these cuts.

The deep cuts being proposed by the majority in areas like job training programs, mass transit, and community reinvestment programs are drawing jobs, private investment, and income out of metropolitan areas.

Cuts in Medicaid and the earned income tax credit will impact the working poor.

And as the Federal Government continues to shift service costs to localities, metropolitan areas will be forced to choose between raising taxes and cutting services and capital budgets.

The result is that our larger cities are increasingly becoming less desirable places in which to live and work. They are becoming warehouses for the poor.

At a time when our cities need a helping hand, this Congress is instead adding to the burden. There is no better example than committee proposal that the pending amendment seeks to address.

Mr. President, we have a convergence of forces going on in America's cities and also in communities we call the "inner beltway communities." These were the first suburban communities after World War II where the infrastructure is now aging. And in our hometown of Baltimore, and in communities like Silver Spring and Oxon Hill, and some others, and in our own home State of Maryland, we see a rising number of homeless. And we see a new kind of homeless.

Sure, the homeless in the past have been romanticized. Lucy played a homeless lady befriended by a young woman. We saw "Down and Out in LA," some cute, clever kind of story about a homeless guy who ends up in a Gucci household and transforms them in some kind of great metamorphosis.

But I will tell you, down and out in LA, down and out in Baltimore is increasing. And when we look at the homeless, we see what is the face of the homeless.

First of all, there are many people who get up and work every day but because they often work at the minimum wage, they cannot afford housing. We see where men, particularly single men, are in and out of the shelters but going to work. We also see an increased amount, in the homeless, of single mothers who have been abandoned, often with no recourse, who then are finding themselves and their children out on the street. And now what we are also seeing is the homeless vet population. And I know the Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, has been an outspoken advocate of that. So what we are seeing is an increase in homelessness because we are seeing an increase in poverty.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that very point?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. The figures here in this report before me show that single men comprise 48 percent of the homeless population. Families with children now comprise 39 percent of the homeless population. The nature of the homeless population is changing.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator knows where I live in Baltimore, not too far from him, in a neighborhood called Fells Point. It used to be an old Polish neighborhood. It has a little bit of an entertainment district. But now we are seeing every day the increase of homelessness and panhandling. Yet when you talk to the panhandlers, these are mothers with children trying to get a few pennies together to hold the body and soul together. I live eight blocks from public housing. I live around the corner from a shelter for battered women. Those battered women are one step from being homeless. Fortunately, we have public housing. But this increase in homelessness is due to a decline in wages. It is also due to the decline of opportunity. So I think, coupled with what is going on in our economy combined with other cuts that are going to hurt the poor, that we really do need this amendment. I am very much concerned about the growing number and the changing profile.

There is nothing romantic about the homeless. The homeless do not think they are romantic. The homeless think that they are homeless. And if you talk to people in our public schools or if you go to Mercy Hospital in downtown Baltimore, they are treating more and—what they are facing in the hospitals is more and more homeless families, particularly the children who have no home and no medical plan.

I thank the Senator for his advocacy. I look forward to his voting for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I very much appreciate the support of my colleague and her leadership on this bill. The appro-

priations subcommittee has been given an allocation which is completely inadequate to meet the funding needs of the programs under her jurisdiction. I know how hard she struggled with that.

Mr. President, let me make this point: State and local governments, nonprofit groups, church groups, and community groups have all joined in a network to try to address the problems of the homeless. They are working at the local level to create comprehensive systems on behalf of the homeless, systems that outreach and screening, emergency shelters, transitional facilities, and permanent housing with services where that is necessary. Supportive housing is the approach to meeting the needs of the homeless about which Mrs. McKinney wrote in her article.

Our approach to addressing the needs of the homeless is beginning to work. This is not the time for the Federal Government to back away from its commitment. I implore my colleague from Missouri to accept this amendment. This amendment makes good sense. We are weighing the decision between dealing with the homeless, as this amendment seeks to do, and leaving those moneys in a section 8 reserve account. I do not think that it is even a close call. We have to try to deal with the homeless problem. We ought not to recede from the fight when we are finally realizing some success.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, how much time is left on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 23 minutes; the Senator from Maryland has 4 minutes 16 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am about ready to yield back my time. I have some very brief comments. I yield myself 3 minutes, and if the proponent of the amendment wishes to conclude, then I will respond briefly, and we can move on to the next amendment. While this is a very important amendment, we do not seem to have a great number of colleagues wishing to debate it. So, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I have already made the point that we are dealing with some very, very sensitive issues, and, unfortunately, I do not see this amendment as being any solution whatsoever because it takes money from an account designed to prevent homelessness in order to add money to those who are currently homeless.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. We are dealing with the same population. Frankly, we are trying to make sure that the money available for section 8 grants does not run out next year.

Let me explain. There are a couple things that can happen. Not only if the rents go up, but if the income of the persons receiving the section 8 certificate or voucher goes down, more

money is needed. And we are digging into the same pot and potentially causing the greater problem.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to.

Mr. SARBANES. Would it not make more sense to take the chance that the section 8 contracts will be adequate funded? The reserves are there for when the rents go up or the income of the section 8-assisted people go down more than anticipated. Both of these outcomes are possibilities, but by no means certainties. Would it not make more sense to take the contingent money and use it to address the current needs of the homeless? Their needs are a certainty.

We are reducing our commitment to the fight against homelessness by 32 percent in this legislation. You have got State and local governments working with private groups to construct this network to try to deal with the homeless problem. They are relying on these resources and I think we should sustain our commitment. We know that the homeless problem is there. The section 8 problem you are talking about is only a possibility. I do not deny that using the reserves does raise the possibility of future section 8 needs.

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. The section 8 offset is not money that appears out of nowhere.

Mr. BOND. If the Senator wishes to make an argument, he has 4 minutes left. To respond to the question, I would say that argument holds no water when he does not make any of the funds available—what is it—until September 30, 1996. This is a shell game.

Mr. SARBANES. No. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. The money in the amendment would become available for purposes of running the formula and for the purposes of HUD developing its regulations. With this amendment, the Senator has an opportunity now to make the formula approach—which he supports, as I understand it—work. The Senator has said himself in the committee report that he needs at least \$1 billion in order to fund a formula adequately. This amendment would provide the Senator with that opportunity. The final commitment of funds would not come until the end of the fiscal year, but the whole process could be put in place. You could have a formula-based homeless program, which everyone says is the direction in which to move. My amendment would give HUD the opportunity to do it.

Mr. BOND. Well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. BOND. All right. Would the proponent of the amendment wish to pursue that? Does he wish to, on his time, state anything further? Because I am prepared to yield back all of the time

as soon as I make some closing comments.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator wishes to respond, I will hear him out and then make my closing statement.

Mr. BOND. I will say, first, we are asking HUD to promulgate rules through negotiated rulemaking and include recommendations by State and localities, as well as homeless assistance providers.

This task is going to go forward in any event. A budget gimmick of making funds available on the last day of the fiscal year does not improve the situation. We are going to be facing a very tight budgetary situation in 1997. To attempt to move funds now and make them available September 30 next year, unfortunately, is not a realistic way of dealing with the problem of homelessness. I share the concern of the Senator from Maryland to make sure we get a new program. Frankly, this does not do anything for it.

I point out that when we rescinded slightly more than this in the rescissions bill, that rescission was more than three-quarters of the way through the fiscal year when we knew what was going to happen in the fiscal year. This is starting out the fiscal year by taking away from that reserve fund. I do not think that makes any sense, particularly when it is not going to be needed until the end of the fiscal year.

I ask this amendment be set aside for a vote to occur—I will, when the time arrives, ask that it be set aside. I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I have no objection to the vote being set aside. I gather the Senator from Vermont wishes to offer his amendment, and then we will vote on both of them at the same time seriatim.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, let me bring to the attention of the other Senator from Maryland, the senior Senator from Maryland, that the leadership is going to try to do some other amendments after the Jeffords, of Vermont, amendment. There are Senators who need a window and both leaders are trying to accommodate that. I think they are looking for votes somewhere around 7:30, 8 o'clock, though it has not been agreed to. That is what is floating out there. So we are trying to get as many amendments in.

Mr. SARBANES. Is the parliamentary situation that a vote is to occur on this amendment at the conclusion of the use of our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order that the vote occur after this amendment, but if at the conclusion of this debate a motion to put it aside takes place, the normal procedure in regular procedure would be to vote at the conclusion of debate and expiration of time.

Mr. SARBANES. That would be the regular order. I do not mind accommodating, but I do not want to see the vote extended way into the evening, I say to my colleagues.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I do not believe it will be extended into the evening, if

the Senator agrees to lay this aside so we can go to the Jeffords amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 3 minutes, 23 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. Let me say to my colleague from Missouri, and I am on the housing committee, you say in your own report, on trying to go to a formula base:

... the Committee is worried that a block grant approach with funds less than \$1,000,000,000 may disadvantage some areas with significant homeless problems and some homeless providers.

That is on page 61.

What this transfer will do is it will enable HUD, in effect, to move to a formula grant program as it develops these negotiated regulations in the coming fiscal year. It is going to take time to develop those regulations, but they cannot structure a competition or an allocation of those moneys unless they are above \$1 billion by your own statement in the report.

So this offers the opportunity to really move forward on the homeless issue, and the price we are paying for it is we are taking some moneys out of the section 8 program, which would not cover then the possibilities to which you have eluded, either that rents would rise or incomes of people getting section 8 would drop. Those are both possibilities, and I concede that.

But the homeless are a reality here and now, and the need to structure the homeless programs in partnership with State and local government and in partnership with the private sector must move forward. And the way to move it forward is to adopt this amendment, bringing the amount for the homeless back up to this year's level and thereby enabling HUD to structure a program which utilizes the formula-grant approach, which the committee on which the Senator and I serve reported out last year on a bipartisan vote, on a 15-to-3 vote.

A formula grant will provide State and local governments with a predictable stream of funding to support their efforts to create comprehensive systems: outreach and screening, emergency shelters, transitional facilities and permanent housing with supportive services.

Comprehensive, coordinated systems such as those are critical for addressing the needs of the homeless population. I urge the adoption of this amendment. It will actually be putting resources to work in their most important and critical need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I go back to the fact we have asked HUD to engage in negotiated rulemaking because HUD is unlikely to be able to put together a block grant during fiscal year 1996. Negotiated rulemaking will provide the homeless advocates with the ability to fashion a block grant to utilize these

moneys, and, frankly, this amendment, although it looks good to have it in an appropriations bill in 1995 that I hope gets signed this year for 1996, will not make a single dollar available, cannot be allocated or obligated during fiscal year 1996.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will—

Mr. BOND. This measure does not do anything except what I think is a shell game to make it look better when, in fact, there is not a dollar that can be allocated during the coming fiscal year because of the restriction put on saying it should be restricted until September 30, 1996.

While we both share the objective of taking care of the homeless, this amendment is less than it appears. It does not accomplish anything. I, therefore, move to table it. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator withhold the tabling motion, because it is just not correct to say it cannot be allocated. It can be allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there is not.

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be put aside until such time as the leaders, by agreement, can establish the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. I object. Is there time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining. The question is—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time.

Mr. SARBANES. There is time on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no debate on a motion to table.

Mr. SARBANES. Has the tabling motion been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time to be yielded, because we have a motion to table and it is not debatable.

Mr. BOND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER CALLS FOR U.N. REFORM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday Secretary of State Warren Christopher delivered an important address to the U.N. General Assembly. Secretary Christopher's speech, which was made at the initiation of the 50th session of the General Assembly, was remarkable not only for the milestone it commemorated, but for the forward-thinking approach it took to the issue of U.N. reform.

Recent congressional debates have demonstrated that continued U.S. support for the United Nations hinges on the issue of reform. At a time when some members of Congress are questioning the fundamental utility of U.S. participation in the United Nations, it is imperative that the U.N. perform its duties effectively and in a cost-efficient manner. As Secretary Christopher said last night,

It is time to recognize that the UN must direct its limited resources to the world's highest priorities, focusing on the tasks that it performs best. The UN's bureaucracy should be smaller, with a clear organizational structure and sharp lines of responsibility. Each program must be held to a simple standard—that is, it must make a tangible contribution to the freedom, security, and well-being of real people in the real world.

Mr. President, as one who was present at the creation of the United Nations, I have tried very hard to see the U.N. live up to its potential and have seen the good works of which it is capable. I underscore and applaud the Secretary of State's call for reform. His initiative has my full support, and I hope it will receive the support of the Congress as well. The very future of the United Nations, and the success of many of our own national security objectives, depend upon it.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary's address to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the full text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE SPOKESMAN,
New York, NY, September 25, 1995.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE WARREN CHRISTOPHER TO THE 50TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Excellencies, Distinguished Guests: It is a privilege to speak to you today on behalf of the United States. A half-century ago, the General Assembly first met in New York—across the river in a converted skating rink at Flushing Meadows. In those modest surroundings, our predecessors began to put into place an ambitious framework they hoped would keep the peace as successfully as they had prosecuted the war.

In the years since, the United Nations has helped to bring peace, prosperity and hope to countless people around the world. Technological change has brought nations closer together than the UN's founders could possibly have foreseen. The United Nations itself has been challenged in unforeseen ways. It has had to manage complex humanitarian emergencies, from civil wars to the mass movement of refugees to health epidemics. This evolution has placed great strains on the organization, and revealed the necessity for far-reaching change in how it is run.

The Clinton Administration has vigorously made the case to our Congress and our people for continued American leadership at the UN. The United States made a commitment to the UN Charter 50 years ago. We are determined to keep our commitment, including our financial obligations.

We will always remember that for millions of people around the world, the UN is far

from a faceless institution: It is, as Harry Truman once said, "a case of food or a box of school books; it is a doctor who vaccinates their children; it is an expert who shows them how to raise more rice, or more wheat." To millions more, it is the difference between peace and war.

Economic and social development, as well as protection of human rights, remain central to the UN's mission. But the UN must change to meet these needs more effectively. When money is wasted in New York, Geneva, or Vienna, and when time is lost to bureaucratic inertia, the people who pay the price are those most vulnerable to famine, disease and violence.

It is time to recognize that the UN must direct its limited resources to the world's highest priorities, focusing on the tasks that it performs best. The UN's bureaucracy should be smaller, with a clear organizational structure and sharp lines of responsibility. Each program must be held to a simple standard—that is, it must make a tangible contribution to the freedom, security, and well-being of real people in the real world.

In the last two years, under the leadership of Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali, the groundwork for substantial change has been laid. The UN has an office with the functions of an inspector general, and a mandate to crack down on waste and fraud. Under-Secretary-General Joe Connor has embarked on an aggressive campaign to improve the UN's management culture, and we fully support his work. The UN Secretariat has moved in the right direction by submitting a budget that begins to restrain spending.

Now the momentum for reform must accelerate. Let me propose a concrete agenda:

First, we must end UN programs that have achieved their purpose, and consolidate programs that overlap, especially in the economic and social agencies. The UN has more than a dozen organizations responsible for development, emergency response, and statistical reporting. We should consider establishing a single agency for each of these functions. We should downsize the UN's regional economic commissions. We should ensure that the functions of the UN Conference on Trade and Development do not duplicate the new WTO. And we should adopt a moratorium on big UN conferences once the present series is completed, concentrating instead on meeting the commitments of those we have held.

Second, we need to streamline the UN Secretariat to make it more efficient, accountable and transparent. Each part of the UN system should be subject to the scrutiny of an inspector general. The UN must not tolerate ethical or financial abuses and its managers should be appointed and promoted on the basis of merit.

Third, we should rigorously scrutinize proposals for new and extended peacekeeping missions, and we should improve the UN's ability to respond rapidly when new missions are approved. We must agree on an equitable scale of peacekeeping assessments that reflects today's economic realities. And we should have a unified budget for peacekeeping operations.

Finally, we must maintain the effectiveness of the Security Council. Germany and Japan should become permanent members. We should ensure that all the world's regions are fairly represented, without making the Council unwieldy.

We welcome the formation of the high-level group on reform, initiated under the leadership of outgoing General Assembly President Essy. Our goal must be that a practical blueprint for UN reform will be adopted before the General Assembly's 50th Session finishes work next fall. The way forward is clear: We have already seen countless